



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/774,574	02/01/2001	Arndt Jentzsch		2513

7590 03/24/2003

Douglas R. Hanscom  
JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2266, Eads Station  
Arlington, VA 22202

EXAMINER

HENCE, ANDREA A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2854

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/774,574

Applicant(s)

JENTZSCH, ARNDT

Examiner

Andrea A. Hence

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 3,4, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Referring to claims 3, 4, 9, and 10, the registration system and registration unit are not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1,2,and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verlinden (EP 0940252) in view of Koguchi et al (6,082,263) in further view of Muth (5,623,877).

Referring to claim 1, Verlinden teaches a method of producing multicolor printing using printing plates provided digitally with images and/or print including: providing a printing forme cylinder adapted for receiving printing plates; removing printing plates used in a previous

Art Unit: 2854

printing task for said printing forme cylinder; providing a printing plate neutralizing device useable to remove images and print from printing plates (Column 8, lines 15-19); applying a coating to said neutralized printing plates (Column 13, lines 13-16); providing a printing plate exposure and development unit; securing said coated printing plates in proper registration in said exposure and development unit; providing new images and print to said coated printing plates in said exposure and development unit and developing said new images; and re-applying said coated printing plates with said new images and print to said printing forme cylinder. (See Abstract, Column 2, lines 2-8).

Verlinden does not teach delivering said used printing plates to said printing plate neutralizing device and neutralizing said used printing plates in said printing plate neutralizing device. Koguchi teaches delivering said used printing plates to said printing plate neutralizing device and neutralizing said used printing plates in said printing plate neutralizing device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the method of Verlinden with the steps of transporting the used printing master with a transferring means to the cleaning apparatus as taught by Koguchi to automate the cleaning.

Verlinden and Koguchi teach all that is claimed as discussed above, except they do not teach an off-press exposure apparatus. Muth teaches performing all plate making functions off-press so as to reduce down time of the press. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the method of Verlinden as modified by Koguchi with an off-press exposure apparatus as taught by Muth in order to reduce the down time of the printing press while plate making is performed.

Referring to claim 2, Verlinden teaches a method of producing multicolor printing using printing plates provided digitally with images and/or print including: providing a printing forme cylinder adapted for receiving printing plates; removing printing plates used in a previous printing task for said printing forme cylinder; providing a printing plate neutralizing device useable to remove images and print from printing plates (Column 8, lines 15-19); providing a printing plate exposure and development unit; securing said coated printing plates in proper registration in said exposure and development unit; providing new images and print to said neutralized printing plates in said exposure and development unit and developing said new images; and re-applying said neutralized printing plates with said new images and print to said printing forme cylinder. (See Abstract, Column 2, lines 2-8).

Verlinden does not teach delivering said used printing plates to said printing plate neutralizing device and neutralizing said used printing plates in said printing plate neutralizing device. Koguchi teaches delivering said used printing plates to said printing plate neutralizing device and neutralizing said used printing plates in said printing plate neutralizing device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the method of Verlinden with the steps of transporting the used printing master with a transferring means to the cleaning apparatus as taught by Koguchi to automate the cleaning.

Verlinden and Koguchi teach all that is claimed as discussed above, except they do not teach an off-press exposure apparatus. Muth teaches performing all plate making functions off-press so as to reduce down time of the press. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the method of Verlinden as modified by Koguchi with an off-press

Art Unit: 2854

exposure apparatus as taught by Muth in order to reduce the down time of the printing press while plate making is performed.

Referring to claims 5 and 6, Verlind teaches all that is claimed in the above rejections except an automatic plate changing device. Koguchi teaches an automatic plate changing device (24). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Verlind such that an automatic plate changing device is taught in order to provide an automated transferring means as taught by Koguchi.

Referring to claims 7 and 8, Verlind teaches including neutralizing said used printing plates using a laser neutralization technique. (See Column 8, lines 15-19).

5. Referring to claims 3, 4, 9 and 10, it would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a registration system/registration unit as claimed since one would always need to maintain proper registration when securing removed printing plates.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea A. Hence whose telephone number is (703) 305-8427. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday; 8:30a-5:30p.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on (703) 305-6619. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2854

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Andrea A. Hence

AAH  
March 17, 2003

  
**STEPHEN R. FUNK**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**